

## 10 SUSY Breaking and the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model

### 10.1 Tree Level Breaking

$$\langle 0|H|0\rangle > 0 \quad (10.1)$$

implies that supersymmetry is broken. So models where  $F_i = 0$  and  $D^a = 0$  cannot be simultaneously solved will have spontaneously broken SUSY.

The Fayet-Iliopoulos mechanism [3] uses a non-zero D-term for a  $U(1)$  gauge group.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{FI}} = \kappa^2 D \quad (10.2)$$

where  $\kappa$  is a constant parameter with dimensions of mass.

$$V = \frac{1}{2}D^2 - \kappa^2 D + gD \sum_i q_i \phi^{*i} \phi_i \quad (10.3)$$

$$D = \kappa^2 - g \sum_i q_i \phi^{*i} \phi_i. \quad (10.4)$$

If  $\phi$  has large positive mass<sup>2</sup> terms, then  $\langle \phi \rangle = 0$  and  $D = \kappa^2$ . In the MSSM however this would give vevs to squarks and sleptons

O’Raifeartaigh models [4] use non-zero F terms.

$$W = -k\Phi_1 + m\Phi_2\Phi_3 + \frac{y}{2}\Phi_1\Phi_3^2. \quad (10.5)$$

$$V = |F_1|^2 + |F_2|^2 + |F_3|^2; \quad (10.6)$$

$$F_1 = k - \frac{y}{2}\phi_3^{*2}; \quad F_2 = -m\phi_3^*; \quad F_3 = -m\phi_2^* - y\phi_1^*\phi_3^*. \quad (10.7)$$

The minimum of the potential is at  $\phi_2 = \phi_3 = 0$  with  $\phi_1$  undetermined.  $V = k^2$  at the minimum of the potential. Around  $\phi_1 = 0$ , the mass spectrum of scalars is

$$0, \quad 0, \quad m^2, \quad m^2, \quad m^2 - yk, \quad m^2 + yk. \quad (10.8)$$

There are 3 fermions with masses

$$0, \quad m, \quad m. \quad (10.9)$$

Since SUSY is broken, quantum corrections will give a mass to the scalars. The effective potential for the scalars can be calculated a la Coleman-Weinberg [5]. However the massless fermion  $\psi_1$  stays massless since it is the Nambu-Goldstone particle for the broken SUSY generator, the *goldstino*.

Fayet-Iliopoulos and O’Raifeartaigh models set the scale of SUSY breaking by a dimensionful parameter ( $\kappa$  or  $k$ ) which is put in by hand. To get a SUSY breaking scale that is naturally small compared to  $M_{Pl}$  we need an asymptotically-free gauge theory that gets strong at some scale

$$\Lambda \sim e^{-8\pi^2/(bg_0^2)} M_{Pl} \quad (10.10)$$

and breaks SUSY non-perturbatively.

We also need new fields beyond the MSSM fields whose auxiliary fields get VEV’s, since a  $D$ -term VEV for  $U(1)_Y$  does not lead to an acceptable spectrum, and there is no gauge-singlet whose  $F$ -term could develop a VEV. The SUSY breaking field can’t have renormalizable tree-level couplings to the MSSM fields. Supersymmetry does not allow (scalar)-(gaugino)-(gaugino) couplings. Also there is a sum rule for tree level breaking

$$\text{Tr}[M_{\text{real scalars}}^2] = 2\text{Tr}[M_{\text{chiral fermions}}^2]. \quad (10.11)$$

Thus we expect that SUSY breaking occurs in a “hidden sector” and is communicated by non-renormalizable interactions or through loops. If the interactions are flavor blind it is possible to suppress flavor changing neutral currents.

## 10.2 SUSY Breaking Scenarios

The two most popular scenarios for SUSY breaking are *gravity mediated* and *gauge mediated* SUSY breaking.

In the *gravity mediated* scenario, interactions with the SUSY breaking sector are suppressed by powers of  $M_{Pl}$ . If the hidden sector has a non-zero  $F$  component for some field,  $\langle F \rangle$ , then the soft terms in the visible sector should be roughly of order

$$m_{\text{soft}} \sim \frac{\langle F \rangle}{M_{Pl}}, \quad (10.12)$$

To get the weak scale we need  $\sqrt{\langle F \rangle} \sim 10^{10} - 10^{11}$  GeV. If SUSY is broken by a gaugino condensate  $\langle 0 | \lambda^a \lambda^b | 0 \rangle = \delta^{ab} \Lambda^3 \neq 0$ , then

$$m_{\text{soft}} \sim \frac{\Lambda^3}{M_{Pl}^2}, \quad (10.13)$$

so  $\Lambda \sim 10^{13}$  GeV.

In the gauge-mediated supersymmetry breaking scenario[8, 9],

$$m_{\text{soft}} \sim \frac{\alpha_a}{4\pi} \frac{\langle F \rangle}{M_{\text{mess}}} \quad (10.14)$$

where  $M_{\text{mess}}$  represents the masses of the messenger fields which couple to ordinary gauge interactions. If  $M_{\text{mess}}$  and  $\sqrt{\langle F \rangle}$  are comparable, then the SUSY breaking scale can be as low as  $\sqrt{\langle F \rangle} \sim 10^4$  -  $10^5$  GeV

### 10.3 The Goldstino

Consider the fermions in a general model  $\Psi = (\lambda^a, \psi_i)$ . The mass matrix is

$$\mathbf{M}_{\text{fermion}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2}g_a(\langle \phi^* \rangle T^a)^i \\ \sqrt{2}g_a(\langle \phi^* \rangle T^a)^j & \langle W^{ij} \rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad (10.15)$$

This matrix has a zero eigenvector

$$\tilde{\Pi} = \begin{pmatrix} \langle D^a \rangle / \sqrt{2} \\ \langle F_i \rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10.16)$$

this can be shown using the facts that the superpotential is gauge invariant and

$$\langle \partial V / \partial \phi_i \rangle = 0 \quad (10.17)$$

The supercurrent conservation equation

$$0 = \partial_\mu J_\alpha^\mu = i\langle F \rangle (\sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \tilde{\Pi}^\dagger)_\alpha + \partial_\mu j_\alpha^\mu + \dots \quad (10.18)$$

implies

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{goldstino}} = i\tilde{\Pi}^\dagger \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \tilde{\Pi} + \frac{1}{\langle F \rangle} (\tilde{\Pi} \partial_\mu j^\mu + h.c.) \quad (10.19)$$

When one takes into account gravity, supersymmetry must be a local symmetry. This means that the spinor  $\epsilon^\alpha$  that parameterizes SUSY transformations is not a constant. This locally supersymmetric theory is called *supergravity* [6, 7]. It contains a spin-2 graviton and its spin-3/2 fermion superpartner called the gravitino,  $\tilde{\Psi}_\mu^\alpha$  which transforms inhomogeneously under local supersymmetry transformations:

$$\delta \tilde{\Psi}_\mu^\alpha = -\partial_\mu \epsilon^\alpha + \dots \quad (10.20)$$

The gravitino is like the “gauge” particle of local SUSY transformations, and when SUSY is spontaneously broken, the gravitino acquires a mass by “eating” the goldstino. This is the other *super-Higgs* mechanism. The gravitino mass can be estimated as

$$m_{3/2} \sim \frac{\langle F \rangle}{M_{Pl}}, \quad (10.21)$$

In gravity-mediated SUSY breaking, the gravitino mass is comparable to  $m_{\text{soft}}$ . In gauge-mediated SUSY breaking the gravitino is much lighter than the MSSM sparticles if  $M_{\text{mess}} \ll M_{Pl}$ , so the gravitino is the LSP. The longitudinal components of the gravitino (the goldstino) have non-gravitational interactions. The decay rate of any sparticle  $\tilde{X}$  into its Standard Model partner  $X$  plus a goldstino  $\tilde{G}$  is given by

$$\Gamma(\tilde{X} \rightarrow X\tilde{G}) = \frac{m_{\tilde{X}}^5}{16\pi\langle F \rangle^2} \left(1 - \frac{m_X^2}{m_{\tilde{X}}^2}\right)^4. \quad (10.22)$$

If  $m_{\tilde{X}} \approx 100$  GeV, and  $\sqrt{\langle F \rangle} < 10^6$  GeV [so  $m_{3/2} < 1$  keV], then the decay  $\tilde{X} \rightarrow X\tilde{G}$  can be observed in a collider.

## 10.4 Gravity-mediated SUSY Breaking

The effective soft-breaking Lagrangian below the Planck scale should be:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = & -\frac{1}{M_{Pl}} F_X \sum_a \frac{1}{2} f_a \lambda^a \lambda^a + h.c. \\ & -\frac{1}{M_{Pl}^2} F_X F_X^* k_j^i \phi_i \phi^{*j} \\ & -\frac{1}{M_{Pl}} F_X \left( \frac{1}{6} y^{ijk} \phi_i \phi_j \phi_k + \frac{1}{2} \mu^{ij} \phi_i \phi_j \right) + h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (10.23)$$

where  $F_X$  is from the hidden sector, and  $\phi_i$  and  $\lambda^a$  are the scalar and gaugino fields in the visible sector.

It is usually assumed that there is a common  $f_a = f$  for the three gauginos; that  $k_j^i = k\delta_j^i$  is the same for all scalars; and that the other couplings are proportional to the corresponding superpotential parameters, so that  $y^{ijk} = \alpha y^{ijk}$  and  $\mu^{ij} = \beta \mu^{ij}$  with universal dimensionless constants  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . Then one finds that the soft terms can be written in terms of:

$$m_{1/2} = f \frac{\langle F_X \rangle}{M_{Pl}}; \quad m_0^2 = k \frac{|\langle F_X \rangle|^2}{M_{Pl}^2}; \quad A_0 = \alpha \frac{\langle F_X \rangle}{M_{Pl}}; \quad B_0 = \beta \frac{\langle F_X \rangle}{M_{Pl}} \quad (10.24)$$

In terms of these, the soft SUSY breaking parameters in eq. (7.17) are:

$$M_3 = M_2 = M_1 = m_{1/2}; \quad (10.25)$$

$$\mathbf{m}_Q^2 = \mathbf{m}_U^2 = \mathbf{m}_D^2 = \mathbf{m}_L^2 = \mathbf{m}_E^2 = m_0^2 \mathbf{1}; \quad m_{H_u}^2 = m_{H_d}^2 = m_0^2; \quad (10.26)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_u = A_0 \mathbf{y}_u; \quad \mathbf{a}_d = A_0 \mathbf{y}_d; \quad \mathbf{a}_e = A_0 \mathbf{y}_e; \quad (10.27)$$

$$b = B_0 \mu. \quad (10.28)$$

However equivalence principle (gravity is flavor blind) does not guarantee these universal terms.

Taking the four SUSY breaking parameters and  $\mu$  and running them down from the unification scale (rather than the Planck scale as one would expect) is referred to as the *minimal supergravity* scenario.

## References

- [1] S.P. Martin, “A supersymmetry primer,” hep-ph/9709356.
- [2] H.E. Haber, “Introductory low-energy supersymmetry,” hep-ph/9306207.
- [3] P. Fayet and J. Iliopoulos, *Phys. Lett. B* **51**, 461 (1974); P. Fayet, *Nucl. Phys.* **B90**, 104 (1975).
- [4] L. O’Raifeartaigh, *Nucl. Phys.* **B96**, 331 (1975).
- [5] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. D* **7**, 1888 (1973).
- [6] S. Ferrara, D.Z. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. D* **13**, 3214 (1976); S. Deser and B. Zumino, *Phys. Lett. B* **62**, 335 (1976); D.Z. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 912 (1976); E. Cremmer et al., *Nucl. Phys.* **B147**, 105 (1979); J. Bagger, *Nucl. Phys.* **B211**, 302 (1983).
- [7] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, and A. van Proeyen, *Nucl. Phys.* **B212**, 413 (1983).
- [8] M. Dine and W. Fischler, *Phys. Lett. B* **110**, 227 (1982); C.R. Nappi and B.A. Ovrut, *Phys. Lett. B* **113**, 175 (1982); L. Alvarez-Gaumé, M. Claudson, and M. B. Wise, *Nucl. Phys.* **B207**, 96 (1982).

- [9] M. Dine, A. E. Nelson, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 1277 (1993); M. Dine, A.E. Nelson, Y. Shirman, *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 1362 (1995); M. Dine, A.E. Nelson, Y. Nir, Y. Shirman, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 2658 (1996).